



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/564,974	07/11/2006	Gian Luca Araldi	283523US0PCT	2230
22850	7590	04/10/2008		
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			EXAMINER SOLOLA, TAOFIQ A	
			ART UNIT 1625	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 04/10/2008	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/564,974	ARALDI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Taofiq A. Solola	1625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 February 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-17, 20-27 and 30-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) 1-17, 30, 32-38 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 20-27, 31 and 39 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 1625

Claims 1-17, 20-27, 30-39 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 20-27, 31, 39, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification does not reasonably provide enablement for using the instant compounds as claimed. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

“In the context of determining whether sufficient “utility as a drug, medicant, and the like in human therapy” has been alleged, it is proper for the examiner to ask for substantiating evidence unless one with ordinary skill in the art would accept the [compounds and the utilities] as obviously correct.” *In re Jolles*, 628 F.2d 1327, 1332 (Fed. Cir. 1980), citing *In re Novak*, 306 F.2d 924 (CCPA 1962); see 340 F.2d 974, 977-78 (CCPA 1965). “A specification disclosure which contains a teaching of the manner and process of making and using the invention . . . must be taken as in compliance with the enabling requirement of the first paragraph of § 112 unless there is reason to doubt the objective truth of the statements contained therein which must be relied on for enabling support.” *In re Brana*, 51 F.3d 1560 (Fed. Cir. 1995), *Id.* at 1566, quoting *Marzocchi*, 439 F.2d 220, 223 (CCPA 1971); *Fiers v. Revel*, 984 F.2d 1164, 1171-72 (Fed. Cir. 1993), quoting *Marzocchi*, 439 F.2d at 223; see also *Armbruster*, 512 F.2d 676, 677 (CCPA 1975); *Knowlton*, 500 F.2d 566, 571 (CCPA 1974); *Bowen*, 492 F.2d 859 (CCPA 1974); *Hawkins*, 486 F.2d 569, 576 (CCPA 1973). Where there is “no indication that one skilled in the

Art Unit: 1625

art would accept without question [the instant compounds and method of use] and no evidence has been presented to demonstrate that the claimed products do have those effects *Novak*, 306 F.2d at 928, an applicant has failed to sufficiently demonstrate sufficient utility and therefore cannot establish enablement.” *In re Rasmusson*, 75 USPQ2d 1297 (CAFC 2005). The claimed utilities are not enabled for the following reasons:

For rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, the following factors must be considered. *In re Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1400, 1404 (CAFC, 1988):

“The factors to be considered [in making an enablement rejection] have been summarized as a) the breadth of the claims, b) the nature of the invention, c) the state of the prior art, d) the relative skill of those in that art, e) the predictability or unpredictability of the art, f) the amount of direction or guidance presented, g) the presence or absence of working examples, h) the quantity of experimentation necessary. The breadth of the claims encompasses many compounds with different substituents. The nature of the invention is using compounds as pharmaceuticals. The claims are drawn to prevention of diseases because, the term “inhibition” or “susceptible” in the claims implies prevention of the disorders.

There is no prior art wherein a compound or sets of compounds are applicable for preventing all the claimed diseases. The specification fails to disclose how a “normal” human predisposed to all the listed diseases would be identified and how each of the diseases could be prevented.

The state of the prior art is that enzymes react in a lock and key mechanism and the structure of the compound must be specific. The presence of methyl instead of H changes the binding of a compound with an enzyme. For example, theophylline and caffeine differ by a methyl group but one is used as a bronchodilator while the other is not used as a pharmaceutical. Hence, there is no absolute predictability or established correlation between

Art Unit: 1625

different substituents on a core that they would behave in a certain way. The uncertainty presents one of ordinary skill in the art with obstacles and prevents her from accepting any therapeutic regimen on its face. The level of ordinary skill in the art of pharmaceutical art is high. The level of unpredictability in pharmaceutical art is very high, e.g. theophylline v. caffeine. It is well established that "the scope of enablement varies inversely with the degree of unpredictability of the factors involved," and physiological activity is generally considered to be an unpredictable factor. See *In re Fisher*, 427 F.2d 833, 839, 166 USPQ 18, 24 (CCPA 1970). The specification, pages 46-62, discloses assays that may be performed to ascertain the applicability of the instant compounds. Such are not conclusive evidence that the compounds in fact have the asserted utilities. Many of the assays are not performed. The results of inhibition of EP2 and EP4 are shown in Tables I-III. However, there is no analysis and discussion of the results. No nexus is established between the results and each disorder. According to the specification, inhibition of COPD, colitis and TNF α 's release by the instant compounds are performed but no result is disclosed. See pages 60-62. Therefore, such are deemed speculations because there is no conclusive evidence that the drugs would work as claimed. Given the limited guidance in the specification one of ordinary skill in the art would have to perform significant amount of experiments to make and use the invention as claimed.

MPEP 2164.01(a) states, "[a] conclusion of lack of enablement means that, based on the evidence regarding any of the above factors, the specification, at the time the application was filed, would not have taught one skilled in the art how to make and/or use the full scope of the claimed invention without undue experimentation. *In re Wright*, 999 F.2d 1557, 1562, 27 USPQ2d 1510, 1513 (Fed. Cir. 1993)." That conclusion is clearly justified here. By deleting the terms the rejection would be overcome.

Art Unit: 1625

Response to Argument

Applicant's arguments filed 2/15/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant listed in vivo assays from the specification and contends the disclosures are sufficient support for the claims. While the disclosure may support treatment of the diseases, such are not support for prevention for reasons set forth above.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1-17, 30, 32-38 are allowable over prior arts of record.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Telephone Inquiry

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Taofiq A. Solola, PhD. JD., whose telephone number is (571) 272-0709.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Janet Andres, can be reached on (571) 272-0867. The fax phone number for this Group is (571) 273-8300.

Art Unit: 1625

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-1600.

/Taofiq A. Solola/

Primary Examiner, 1625

April 5, 2008